UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-0903

MAILED

SEP 1 4 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Sadao Nishibori et al.

Application No. 09/843,919 : ON PETITION

Filed: April 30, 2001

Attorney Docket No. DE1615 :

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed May 28, 2009, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

The application became abandoned for failure to timely reply within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.113 to the final Office action, mailed December 14, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the application became abandoned on March 15, 2008.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m); (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required by 37 CFR 1.137(d). Where there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 was unintentional, the Director may require additional information. See MPEP 711.03(c)(II)(C) and (D). The instant petition lacks item(s) (1).

The proposed reply required for consideration of a petition to revive must be a Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2)), an amendment that *prima facie* places the application in condition for allowance, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and submission (37 CFR 1.114), or the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b). *See* MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(A)(2). Since the amendment submitted on May 28, 2009, does not *prima facie* place the application in condition for allowance, the reply required must be a Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee), RCE, or the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b). A copy of the Advisory Action explaining why the amendment was not accepted is enclosed with this decision.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By Mail:

Mail Stop PETITION

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office

Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions

Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

The centralized facsimile number is (571) 273-8300.

amesh Krishnamusthy

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to JoAnne Burke at (571) 272-4584.

Ramesh Krishnamurthy Petitions Examiner

Office of Petitions

Enclosed: Copy of Advisory Action

cc:

Lowe Hauptman Ham & Berner, LLP

1700 Diagonal Road

Suite 300

Alexandria, VA 22314

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/843,919	NISHIBORI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Elizabeth M. Cole	1794	

•	Elizabeth M. Cole	1794		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ado	lress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF		•		
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliantime periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)	
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final reject	on.	
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	• •	136(a) and the appropria	te extension fee	
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of e under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b	xtension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig er than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropring in ally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as	
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	nliance with 37 CER 41 37 must be	filed within two mont	ns of the date of	
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ext a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be file	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since	
AMENDMENTS	hut prior to the data of filing a brief	t will make be antered b		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further c (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE bel	onsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.	-	jected claims.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		•	•	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cance non-allowable claim(s).				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is properties that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an	explanation of	
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,5,10,13,15,22,26,27,31,34,38,39,43</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>,44,48-51,57 and 61-63</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affidat	lotice of Appeal will <u>ne</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanati REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered been See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s)13. ☐ Other:	. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
			•	
	/Elizabeth M. Cole/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1794		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment raises new issue such as that the article has an "essentially" uniform thikcness. Further, the claims change the scope of the claims and would require careful consideration to be sure that there is support for the language currently employed